

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To: G.E. EHRLICH (1995) LTD. 11 MENACHEM BEGIN STREET RAMAT GAN, ISRAEL 52 521

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	03 AUG 2006
-------------------------------------	--------------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference 29953
--

FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
--

International application No. PCT/IL05/01173	International filing date (day/month/year) 09 November 2005 (09.11.2005)	Priority date (day/month/year) 01 June 2005 (01.06.2005)
---	---	---

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC: A61K 49/00 (2006.01) USPC: 424/9.1

Applicant SPECTRUM DYNAMICS (ISRAEL) LTD.
--

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201	Date of completion of this opinion 03 July 2006 (03.07.2006)	Authorized officer <i>Valerie Bell-Harris</i> D. L. Jones Telephone No. ((571) 272-1600
--	---	--

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/IL05/01173

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

- ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed
- ☐ a translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☐ a sequence listing
- ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☐ on paper
- ☐ in electronic form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IL05/01173

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non-obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

- ☐ the entire international application
- ☒ claims Nos. 7-1025

because:

- ☐ the said international application, or the said claim Nos. _____ relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international search (*specify*):

- ☒ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 7-1025 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

Please See Continuation Sheet

- ☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

- ☐ no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. _____

- ☐ a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the sequence listing; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit:

- ☐ furnish a sequence listing on paper complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.
- ☐ furnish a sequence listing in electronic form complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.
- ☐ pay the required late furnishing fee for the furnishing of a sequence listing in response to an invitation under Rules 13*ter*.1(a) or (b).

- ☐ a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the tables related to the sequence listings; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit, furnish such tables in electronic form complying with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions, and such tables were not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.

- ☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in electronic form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

- ☐ See Supplemental Box for further details.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IL05/01173

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>5 and 6</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-4</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-6</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-6</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 5 and 6 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2) because the prior art does not teach the claim limitations as written.

Claims 1-4 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Contag et al (US Patent No. 6,638,752).

Contag et al disclose biodetectors targeted to specific ligands. The biodetectors are used for detecting and quantifying molecules in liquid, gas, or matrices. The method involves biodetectors comprising a molecular switching mechanism to express a reporter gene upon interaction with target substances. For example, imaging of the light emitting biodetector entities may involve the use of a photodetector. If necessary, localization of the signal may be determined by integrating photon emission until an image is constructed. Once a photon emission image is generated, it is typically superimposed on a normal reflected light image of the subject to provide a frame of reference for the source of the emitted photons. Such a composite image is then analyzed to determine the location and/or amount of a target in the subject. Simple quantitation of the numbers of photons emitted from a sample indicate the concentration of the light-emitting reporter. The number of photons would therefore be proportional to the amount of targeted ligand that a specific detector is sensing. Without the constraints imposed by the need for an image, detectors may be placed in very close proximity to the light emitting biodetectors; thus, optimizing the optical detection and sensitivity of the assay. Microchannel plate intensifiers may be used in such a configuration resulting in single photon detection (see column 8, lines 28-68; column 9, lines 25-54; column 16, lines 13-52). The signals generated by photodetector devices which count photons need to be processed by an image processor in order to construct an image which can be, for example, displayed on a monitor or printed on a video printer. Such image processors are typically sold as part of systems which include the sensitive photon counting camera. The image processors are usually connected to a personal computer (column 17, lines 28-46). The biodetectors may be used to diagnose diseases, detect clinically relevant substances, detect environmental contaminants, and detect food contaminants (column 18, line 28 through column 19, line 54). Thus, both Applicant and Contag et al disclose a method of radioactive emission measures of a structure wherein radioactive emission measurement of a body are determined; radioactive emission measurements are analyzed; and additional views for measurement are analyzed.

Claims 5 and 6 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Contag et al (US Patent No. 6,638,752).

Contag et al (see discussion above) fail to specifically state that the additional views comprising determining that a photon count at a given view yields a measurement error below a specified value. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made that the additional views would be analyzed for error below a specified value because a skilled practitioner in the art would recognize that the duplicate images at specified conditions would enable one to determine the standard of deviation and mean value between the images.

Claims 1-6 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33 (4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IL05/01173

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Section III. Non-establishment of opinion (description/claims/drawings unclear)

In the claims of the instant invention, the voluminous possible combinations make it virtually impossible to determine the full scope and complete meaning of the claimed subject matter. In particular, the claims are directed to a method of radioactive emission measurements of a body structure; a measurement unit for performing radioactive emission measurements of a body structure; a method of measuring kinetic parameters of a radiopharmaceutical in a body; a method of measuring kinetic parameters of a radiopharmaceutical in an organ; a drug formulation; a diagnostic kit; a method of imaging tissue; a method of obtaining image data; an apparatus for storing multidimensional imaging in a plurality of voxels; a method of assigning characteristics to a three dimensional imaging scan containing kinetic parameters; a pharmaceutical substance, and so forth. As a result, since the various components necessary to make/use each and every invention set forth in the instant application cannot be determined, it is unclear for what invention/inventions protection is sought. Thus, the claims as written cannot be regarded as being a concise description and as such do not comply with the requirements of PCT Article 6. Furthermore, it should be noted that due to the unlimited number of possible component combinations, it is impossible to perform a meaningful and timely search of the invention. Therefore, a search was conducted on the first discernible invention which has the following limitations as found in claims 1-6: a method having the limitation of independent claim 1 wherein (a) the views is associated with viewing parameters relating to the detector unit location; and (b) the analyzing step comprises determining that a photon count at a given view yields a measurement error below a specified error value which comprises extending a duration of a current view to obtain a required error rate.

NOTES TO FORM PCT/ISA/220

These Notes are intended to give the basic instructions concerning the filing of amendments under Article 19. The Notes are based on the requirements of the Patent Cooperation Treaty, the Regulations and the Administrative Instructions under that Treaty. In case of discrepancy between these Notes and those requirements, the latter are applicable. For more detailed information, see also the *PCT Applicant's Guide*, a publication of WIPO.

In these Notes, "Article," "Rule" and "Section" refer to the provisions of the PCT, the PCT Regulations and the PCT Administrative Instructions, respectively.

INSTRUCTIONS CONCERNING AMENDMENTS UNDER ARTICLE 19

The applicant has, after having received the international search report and the written opinion of the International Searching Authority, one opportunity to amend the claims of the international application. It should however be emphasized that, since all parts of the international application (claims, description and drawings) may be amended during the international preliminary examination procedure, there is usually no need to file amendments of the claims under Article 19 except where, e.g. the applicant wants the latter to be published for the purposes of provisional protection or has another reason for amending the claims before international publication. Furthermore, it should be emphasized that provisional protection is available in some States only (see *PCT Applicant's Guide*, Volume I/A, Annexes B1 and B2).

The attention of the applicant is drawn to the fact that amendments to the claims under Article 19 are not allowed where the International Searching Authority has declared, under Article 17(2), that no international search report would be established (see *PCT Applicant's Guide*, Volume I/A, paragraph 296).

What parts of the international application may be amended ?

Under Article 19, only the claims may be amended.

During the international phase, the claims may also be amended (or further amended) under Article 34 before the International Preliminary Examining Authority. The description and drawings may only be amended under Article 34 before the International Preliminary Examining Authority.

Upon entry into the national phase, all parts of the international application may be amended under Article 28 or, where applicable, Article 41.

When ? Within 2 months from the date of transmittal of the international search report or 16 months from the priority date, whichever time limit expires later. It should be noted, however, that the amendments will be considered as having been received on time if they are received by the International Bureau after the expiration of the applicable time limit but before the completion of the technical preparations for international publication (Rule 46.1).

Where not to file the amendments ?

The amendments may only be filed with the International Bureau and not with the receiving Office or the International Searching Authority (Rule 46.2).

Where a demand for international preliminary examination has been/is filed, see below.

How ? Either by cancelling one or more entire claims, by adding one or more new claims or by amending the text of one or more of the claims as filed.

A replacement sheet must be submitted for each sheet of the claims which, on account of an amendment or amendments, differs from the sheet originally filed.

All the claims appearing on a replacement sheet must be numbered in Arabic numerals. Where a claim is cancelled, no renumbering of the other claims is required. In all cases where claims are renumbered, they must be renumbered consecutively (Section 205(b)).

The amendments must be made in the language in which the international application is to be published.

What documents must/may accompany the amendments ?

Letter (Section 205(b)):

The amendments must be submitted with a letter.

The letter will not be published with the international application and the amended claims. It should not be confused with the "Statement under Article 19(1)" (see below, under "Statement under Article 19(1)").

The letter must be in English or French, at the choice of the applicant. However, if the language of the international application is English, the letter must be in English; if the language of the international application is French, the letter must be in French.